arXiv:1609.05943v1 [math.AP] 19 Sep 2016

# ENTROPY METHODS AND CONVERGENCE TO EQUILIBRIUM FOR VOLUME-SURFACE REACTION-DIFFUSION SYSTEMS

KLEMENS FELLNER, BAO QUOC TANG

Abstract. We consider two volume-surface reaction-diffusion systems arising from cell biology. The first system describes the localisation of the protein Lgl in the asymmetric division of Drosophila SOP stem cells, while the second system models the JAK2/STAT5 signalling pathway. Both model systems have in common that i) different species are located in *different spatial compartments*, ii) the involved chemical reaction kinetics between the species satisfies a *complex balance condition* and iii) that the associated complex balance equilibrium is *spatially inhomogeneous*. By using recent advances on the entropy method for complex balanced reaction-diffusion systems, we show for both systems exponential convergence to the equilibrium which constants and rates, which can be explicitly estimated.

## 1. Introduction and main results

Various physical, chemical, biological or ecological systems involve processes on different spatial compartments. A particular important example is given by considering quantities on a domain and on its surrounding boundary. Reactions taking place in these situations result in a class of PDE models, which are called *Volume-Surface Reaction-Diffusion* systems (hereafter, we will use the abbreviation VSRD systems). The intrinsic volume-surface coupling of VSRD systems introduces new difficulties in both the mathematical and the numerical analysis compared to classical reaction-diffusion systems supported on only one spatial domain.

Recently, a rapidly increasing amount of attention has been devoted to the mathematical theory of VSRD systems arising from such different applications as fluid mechanics [16, 21], ecology [1, 2, 3], crystal growth [20] or, especially, cell biology, see e.g. [9, 11, 13, 17].

This paper aims to investigate the large time behaviour of two particular linear VSRD systems arising from two different applicational backgrounds in cell biology: the first being a models for the localisation of the key-protein Lgl during the asymmetric stem cell division of SOP precursor cells in Drosophila (see e.g. [11]), the second one being a model on the so-called JAK2/STAT5 signalling pathway, see [13]. In both examples, the cell cytoplasm constitutes the volume domain and the surrounding cell-membrane/cortex constitutes the surrounding boundary. In the JAK2/STAT5 model, also the volume of cell nucleus and its boundary are considered. Moreover, reactions occur within and between the volume- and surface-compartments, which do not satisfy the so called detailed balance condition, but the more general *complex balance condition*, see e.g. [18].

The main results of this paper prove explicit exponential convergence to the complex balance equilibrium by using the so-called *entropy method*. In particular, we are able to extend some recent previous results on the entropy method for complex balanced reaction networks to apply to spatially inhomogeneous equilibrium states.

The key method applied in this work, i.e. the entropy method, has recently become a very powerful tool in proving exponential convergence to equilibrium with explicit rates for reaction-diffusion systems, but mostly under the assumption of the detailed balance condition and on a single spatial domain (see e.g. [15, 5, 6, 22, 12] and the reference therein). The entropy method for complex balance reaction-diffusion networks was so far only considered on a single domain for linear systems in [10] or for nonlinear systems in [7].

The current paper constitutes the first available results of the entropy method for volume-surface systems with spatially inhomogeneous complex balance equilibria.

In the next two sections, we give the details of considering VSRD systems and state the main results.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B40, 35K57.

*Key words and phrases.* Reaction-Diffusion Equations, Volume-Surface Coupling, Surface diffusion, Asymmetric Stem Cell Division, JAK2/STAT5 signalling pathway, Convergence to Equilibrium, Entropy Method.

1.1. **A VSRD model for the localisation of Lgl during asymmetric stem cell division.**

In stem cells undergoing asymmetric cell division, particular proteins (so-called cell-fate determinants) are localised at the cortex of only one of the two daughter cells during mitosis. These cell-fate determinants trigger in the following the differentiation of one daughter cell into specific tissue while the other daughter cell remains a stem cell.

In Drosophila, SOP precursor stem cells provide a well-studied biological example model of asymmetric stem cell division, see e.g. [4, 19, 25] and the references therein. In particular, asymmetric cell division of SOP cells is driven by the asymmetric localisation of the key protein Lgl (Lethal giant larvae), which exists in two conformational states: a non-phosphorylated form which regulates the localisation of the cell-fate-determinants in the membrane of one daughter cell, and a phosphorylated form which is inactive.

The asymmetric localisation of Lgl during mitosis is the result of the activation of the kinase aPKC, which phosphorylates Lgl (as part of a highly evolutionary conserved protein complex) only on a subpart of the cortex, as well as the results of the weakly reversible reaction/sorption dynamics of the two conformations of Lgl between cortex and cytoplasm. In particular, it is the irreversible release of phosphorylated Lgl from the cortex, which initiates the asymmetric localisation of Lgl upon the activation of aPKC.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$ describe the cell cytoplasm as a connected, bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ (e.g. $\partial\Omega \in C^{2+\epsilon}$, $\epsilon > 0$). Denote by $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ the surrounding cell cortex. Moreover, the cell cortex is divided into two disjoint, connected subsets $\Gamma_1$ and $\Gamma_2$ with $\Gamma = \Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_2$ and where $\Gamma_2$ is the active part of the cell cortex, where phosphorylation takes place.

Concerning the various conformations of Lgl, we denote by $L$ and $P$ the concentrations of non-phosphorylated Lgl and phosphorylated Lgl within the volume domain $\Omega$. Moreover, the concentrations of non-phosphorylated Lgl and phosphorylated Lgl on the cell cortex are denoted by $\ell$ and $p$, respectively. Note that $\ell$ is supported on $\Gamma$ while $p$ is supported only on the sub-domain $\Gamma_2$, since phosphorylation only occurs on $\Gamma_2$.

Schematically, we consider the following reactions between the four different conformations of Lgl:




FIGURE 1. The reaction dynamics between $L, P, l$ and $p$

with positive reaction rate constants $\alpha, \beta, \lambda, \gamma, \sigma$ and $\xi$. Moreover, we assume positive diffusion coefficients of $L, P$ on $\Omega$, of $\ell$ on $\Gamma$ and of $p$ on $\Gamma_2$, i.e. $d_L, d_P, d_\ell, d_p > 0$, respectively. Then, applying the mass action law, the resulted VSRD system consists of two volume equations

$$\begin{cases} L_t - d_L \Delta L = -\beta L + \alpha P, & x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \\ P_t - d_P \Delta P = \beta L - \alpha P, & x \in \Omega,\ t > 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1a}$$

and two surface equations

$$\begin{cases} \ell_t - d_\ell \Delta_\Gamma \ell = \lambda L - (\gamma + \sigma \chi_{\Gamma_2})\ell, & x \in \Gamma,\ t > 0, \\ p_t - d_p \Delta_{\Gamma_2} p = \sigma \ell - \xi p, & x \in \Gamma_2,\ t > 0, \\ \partial_{\nu_2} p = 0, & x \in \partial\Gamma_2,\ t > 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1b}$$

which are connected via mixed Neumann/Robin boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} d_L \partial_\nu L = -\lambda L + \gamma \ell, & x \in \Gamma,\ t > 0, \\ d_P \partial_\nu P = \chi_{\Gamma_2} \xi p, & x \in \Gamma,\ t > 0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1c}$$

and subject to nonnegative initial data

$$\begin{cases} L(x,0) = L_0(x), \quad P(x,0) = P_0(x), & x \in \Omega, \\ \ell(x,0) = \ell_0(x), & x \in \Gamma, \\ p(x,0) = p_0(x), & x \in \Gamma_2, \end{cases} \tag{1.1d}$$

where $\nu$ and $\nu_2$ are the outward unit normal vectors of $\Gamma$ and $\partial\Gamma_2$, respectively, and $\Delta_\Gamma$ and $\Delta_{\Gamma_2}$ are Laplace-Beltrami operators on $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma_2$, respectively. Moreover, $\chi_{\Gamma_2}$ denotes the characteristic function of the boundary part $\Gamma_2$.

Note that the above system (1.1) conserves the total mass of Lgl, which is expressed in the following conservation law:

$$\int_\Omega (L(t,x)+P(t,x))\,dx+\int_\Gamma l(t,x)\,dS+\int_{\Gamma_2} p(t,x)\,dS \\ =\int_\Omega (L_0(x)+P_0(x))\,dx+\int_\Gamma l_0(x)\,dS+\int_{\Gamma_2} p_0(x)\,dS>0, \qquad \forall t>0 \quad (1.2)$$

Concerning the existence of global weak solutions of (1.1), we refer to [11], where also the quasi-steady-state approximation in the limit $\xi\to+\infty$ and numerical simulations were carried out.

The first main result of this paper is stated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Exponential convergence to equilibrium of Lgl system (1.1))**.**
*Assume that $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$, $n=2,3$ is a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary $\Gamma=\partial\Omega$. Moreover, $\Gamma=\Gamma_1\cup\Gamma_2$ is the union of two disjoint, connected subsets and $\Gamma_2$ has a smooth boundary $\partial\Gamma_2$.*

*Then, for any positive initial mass $M>0$, the system (1.1) possesses a unique positive equilibrium $(L_\infty,P_\infty,\ell_\infty,p_\infty)$ satisfying the mass conservation law*

$$\int_\Omega (L_\infty(x)+P_\infty(x))dx+\int_\Gamma \ell_\infty(x)dS+\int_{\Gamma_2} p_\infty(x)dS=M.$$

*Moreover, $L_\infty\in C(\overline{\Omega})\cap H^2(\Omega)$, $P_\infty\in L^\infty(\Omega)\cap H^{3/2}(\Omega)$, $\ell_\infty\in C(\Gamma)\cap H^2(\Gamma_2)$ and $p\in C(\overline{\Gamma_2})\cap H^2(\Gamma_2)$, and we have the following upper- and lower bounds*

$$0<a\le L_\infty(x)\le A \quad \text{for all } x\in\overline{\Omega},$$
$$0<a\le P_\infty(x)\le A \quad \text{for almost all } x\in\Omega,$$
$$0<a\le \ell_\infty(x)\le A \quad \text{for all } x\in\Gamma$$

*and*

$$0<a\le p_\infty(x)\le A \quad \text{for all } x\in\overline{\Gamma_2}$$

*for some constants $0<a\le A<+\infty$.*

*Finally, every global weak solution to (1.1) with positive initial mass $M$ (as constructed in [11]) converges exponentially to $(L_\infty,P_\infty,\ell_\infty,p_\infty)$ in the following sense*

$$\int_\Omega \frac{|L(t)-L_\infty|^2}{L_\infty}dx+\int_\Omega \frac{|P(t)-P_\infty|^2}{P_\infty}dx+\int_\Gamma \frac{|\ell(t)-\ell_\infty|^2}{\ell_\infty}dx+\int_{\Gamma_2}\frac{|p(t)-p_\infty|^2}{p_\infty}dx\le C_0e^{-\lambda_0 t}$$

*for all $t>0$, where $\lambda_0$ is as in Lemma 3.2 and both $C_0$ and $\lambda_0$ can be computed explicitly.*

### 1.2. **A PDE/ODE system modelling the JAK2/STAT5 signalling pathway.**

The communication between cells in multicellular organisms is often mediated by signalling molecules secreted to the extracellular space, which then bind to cell surface receptors, see [13]. However, the modalities of the transport from the site of signal transducer and activator of transcription (STAT) phosphorylation at the plasma membrane to the site of action in the nucleus is still unclear. In [13], Friedmann, Neumann and Rannacher introduced a mixed PDE/ODE model system to analyse the influence of the cell shape on the regulatory response to the activated pathway.

Following the notations in [13], we denote by $u_0$ and $u_1$ the unphosporylated and phosphorylated STAT5 in the cytoplasm, while $u_2$ and $u_3$ denote the unphosphorylated and phosphorylated STAT5 in the nucleus, respectively. Moreover, we denote by $u_4,\dots,u_7$ so-called "fictitious concentrations", which describe processes in the nucleus via linear delay equations. The reaction dynamics of the eight species $u_i$ with $i=0,1,\dots,7$ are represented by following diagram in Fig. 2.

The JAK2/STAT5 model considers a smooth, bounded domain $\Omega_0\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ and distinguishes $\Omega_{\rm nuc}\subsetneq\Omega_0$ the domain of the cell nucleus and $\Omega_{\rm cyt}=\Omega_0\backslash\Omega_{\rm nuc}$ the cell cytoplasm. With a little abuse of notation, we denote by $\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}=\partial\Omega_0$ the membrane of the cell, while $\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}$ is the boundary of the nucleus.

The following mixed PDE/ODE model was considered in [13]: The two PDEs

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_0(t,x)=D\Delta u_0(t,x), & t>0, \quad x\in\Omega_{\rm cyt},\\ D\partial_{n_1}u_0(t,y)=-\frac{r_{\rm act}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}|}p_{JAK}u_0(t,y), & t>0, \quad y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt},\\ D\partial_{n_2}u_0(t,y)=-\frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}u_0(t,y)+\frac{r_{\rm exp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}u_2(t), & t>0, \quad y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}, \end{cases} \quad (1.3a)$$




FIGURE 2. Reaction network of the JAK2/STAT5 signalling pathway

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u_1(t,x) = D\Delta u_1(t,x), & t>0, \quad x\in\Omega_{\rm cyt}, \\ D\partial_{n_1} u_1(t,y) = \frac{r_{\rm act}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}|} p_{JAK} u_0(t,y), & t>0, \quad y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}, \\ D\partial_{n_2} u_1(t,y) = -\frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_1(t,y), & t>0, \quad y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}, \end{cases} \tag{1.3b}$$

and six ODEs

$$\begin{cases} (u_2)'(t) + \frac{r_{\rm exp}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_2(t) = \frac{r_{\rm delay}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_7(t) + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}||\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} \int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_0(t,y) dS, \\ (u_3)'(t) + \frac{r_{\rm delay}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_3(t) = \frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}||\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} \int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_1(t,y) dS, \\ (u_i)'(t) + \frac{r_{\rm delay}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_i(t) = \frac{r_{\rm delay}}{|\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_{i-1}(t), \quad i=4,5,6,7, \end{cases} \tag{1.3c}$$

subject to nonnegative initial data $u_0(x,0) = u_0^{in}(x), u_1(x,0) = u_1^{in}(x)$, $x\in\Omega$, $u_i(0) = u_i^{in}$ for $i = 2,3,\dots,7$, where $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ are outward normals of $\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}$ and $\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}$ respectively. Note that the system (1.3) satisfies the mass conservation law

$$\int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (u_0(t,x)+u_1(t,x))dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}| \sum_{i=2}^{7} u_i(t) = \int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (u_0^{in}(x)+u_1^{in}(x))dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}| \sum_{i=2}^{7} u_i^{in}, \qquad \forall t>0. \tag{1.4}$$

The well-posedness of the mixed PDE/ODE model (1.3) was shown in [13]. Moreover, in pure ODEs case, the authors proved exponential convergence to equilibrium by extensively studying the structure of the reaction matrix. This approach, however, doesn't apply to the PDE/ODE case and the authors were only able to prove Lyapunov stability of the stationary states of (1.3).

The second main result of this paper proves exponential convergence to equilibrium of the mixed PDE/ODE JAK2/STAT5 model (1.3).

**Theorem 1.2** (Exponential convergence to equilibrium for the JAK2/STAT5 model (1.3))**.**
*Let $\Omega_0, \Omega_{\rm nuc}, \Omega_{\rm cyt} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n\geq 2$ be a smooth, bounded domains with $\Omega_{\rm nuc} \subsetneq \Omega_0$, $\Omega_{\rm cyt} = \Omega_0\backslash\Omega_{\rm nuc}$ and $\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt} = \partial\Omega_0$.*

*Then, for any positive initial mass $M>0$, system (1.3) possesses a unique equilibrium $(u_{0,\infty},\dots,u_{7,\infty})$ satisfying the mass conservation law*

$$\int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (u_{0,\infty}(x)+u_{1,\infty}(x))dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}| \sum_{i=2}^{7} u_{i,\infty} = M > 0. \tag{1.5}$$

*Moreover, $u_{2,\infty},\dots,u_{7,\infty}$ are positive and $u_{0,\infty}, u_{1,\infty} \in C(\overline{\Omega}_{\rm cyt}) \cap C^2(\Omega_{\rm cyt})$ satisfy*

$$0 < b \leq u_{0,\infty}(x), u_{1,\infty}(x) \leq B < +\infty \qquad \text{for all } x\in\Omega_{\rm cyt}$$

*for some constants $0<b\leq B\leq +\infty$.*

*Finally, any global weak solution $(u_i)_{i=0,1,\dots,7}$ to (1.3) with positive initial mass $M$ (as constructed in [13]) converges exponentially to the equilibrium $(u_{i,\infty})_{i=0,1,\dots,7}$ in the sense that*

$$\int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} \left( \frac{|u_0(t,x)-u_{0,\infty}(x)|^2}{u_{0,\infty}(x)} + \frac{|u_1(t,x)-u_{1,\infty}(x)|^2}{u_{1,\infty}(x)} \right) dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}| \sum_{i=2}^{7} \frac{|u_i(t)-u_{i,\infty}|^2}{u_{i,\infty}} \leq C_1 e^{-\lambda_1 t},$$

*for all $t>0$, where $\lambda_1$ is as in Lemma 4.2 and $C_1, \lambda_1$ are constants, which can be computed explicitly in terms of the domains, parameters and initial mass $M$.*

**Remark 1.1.** *In system (1.3), the diffusion coefficients of $u_0$ and $u_1$ are taken the same as in [13]. However, the proof of Theorem 1.2 holds equally for different diffusion coefficients for $u_0$ and $u_1$, e.g. $u_0$ diffuses with the rate $D_0>0$ and $u_1$ diffuses with the rate $D_1>0$.*

## 2. Preliminaries

The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 use some previous results about linear complex balance reaction-diffusion networks proven in [10], which we shall briefly recall in the following. The interested reader is referred to [10] for more details.

We consider a first order (i.e. linear) reaction network of the form

$$S_i \underset{a_{ji}}{\overset{a_{ij}}{\rightleftarrows}} S_j \qquad\qquad i \neq j = 1, 2, \dots, N, \tag{$\mathcal{N}$}$$

Figure 3. A general first-order chemical reaction network

where $S_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N$, are different chemical substances (or species) and $a_{ij}, a_{ji} \geq 0$ are constant reaction rates. In particular, $a_{ij}$ denotes the reaction rates from the species $S_j$ to $S_i$. The considered reaction network is contained in a bounded vessel (or reactor) $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, where $\Omega$ is a smooth, bounded domain with outer unit normal $\nu$. The substances $S_i$ are described by spatial-temporal concentrations $u_i(t, x)$ at position $x \in \Omega$ and time $t \geq 0$. In addition, each substance $S_i$ is assumed to diffuse with a diffusion coefficient $d_i \geq 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$. Finally, using the mass action law kinetics as model for the reaction rates leads to the following linear reaction-diffusion system:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{c}_t = \mathbb{D}\Delta \boldsymbol{c} + A\boldsymbol{c}, & x \in \Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \partial_\nu \boldsymbol{c} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0, \\ \boldsymbol{c}(x, 0) = \boldsymbol{c}_0(x) \geq 0, & x \in \Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{c}(t, x) = [u_1(t, x), u_2(t, x), \dots, u_N(t, x)]^T$ denotes the vector of concentrations subject to non-negative initial conditions $\boldsymbol{c}_0(x) = [u_{1,0}(x) \geq 0, u_{2,0}(x) \geq 0, \dots, u_{N,0}(x) \geq 0]^T$, $\mathbb{D} = \operatorname{diag}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_N)$ denotes the diagonal diffusion matrix and the reaction matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} a_{ij} \geq 0, & \text{for all } i \neq j, \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, N, \\ a_{jj} = -\sum_{i=1, i\neq j}^{N} a_{ij}, & \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, N. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

The solution to system (2.1) satisfies the following mass conservation law

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega u_i(t, x)dx = M := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega u_{i,0}(x)dx > 0 \qquad \text{for all } t > 0. \tag{2.3}$$

To study the convergence to equilibrium we consider the following quadratic relative entropy functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_1|\boldsymbol{c}_2)(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_\Omega \frac{|u_i|^2}{v_i} dx \tag{2.4}$$

between two solutions $\boldsymbol{c}_1 = [u_1, u_2, \dots, u_N]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_2 = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_N]^T$ (with respect to possibly different initial data) and its entropy dissipation

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}_1|\boldsymbol{c}_2) = -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_1|\boldsymbol{c}_2) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{N} d_i \int_\Omega v_i \left|\nabla \frac{u_i}{v_i}\right|^2 dx + \sum_{i,j=1; i<j}^{N} \int_\Omega (a_{ij}v_j + a_{ji}v_i)\left(\frac{u_i}{v_i} - \frac{u_j}{v_j}\right)^2 dx. \tag{2.5}$$

The network $\mathcal{N}$ is called *weakly reversible* if for any reaction $S_i \xrightarrow{a_{ji}} S_j$ with $a_{ji} > 0$, there exists $S_{k_1}, \dots, S_{k_r}$ such that $S_j \equiv S_{k_0} \xrightarrow{a_{k_1k_0}} S_{k_1} \xrightarrow{a_{k_2k_1}} S_{k_2} \to \dots \to S_{k_r} \xrightarrow{a_{k_{r+1}k_r}} S_i \equiv S_{k_{r+1}}$ with $a_{k_{i+1}k_i} > 0$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, r$. Intuitively, a network $\mathcal{N}$ is weakly reversible if for any reaction from $S_i$ to $S_j$ we can find a returning chain of reactions, which starts from $S_j$ and finishes at $S_i$.

If $\mathcal{N}$ is weakly reversible, then the associated reaction graph may be composed of multiple disjoint strongly connected components, see [10]. However, these components are completely independent from one another since every node of a first order reaction network represents only one specie. Therefore, all such disjoint components can be treated separately from one another and we *shall consider w.l.o.g. in the following only weakly reversible networks consisting of one strongly connect component.* Finally, all weakly reversible first order reaction networks satisfy the complex balance condition, see [10].

The following theorem is one of the main results in [10].

**Theorem 2.1** (Exponential convergence to equilibrium for first order reaction networks, [10]). *Assume that the reaction network $\mathcal{N}$ is weakly reversible and consists w.l.o.g. of only one strongly connect component. Moreover, assume that there is at least one positive diffusion coefficient, that is, there exists $i_0$ such that $d_{i_0} > 0$. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 1$ be a bounded domain with sufficiently smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ (e.g. $\partial\Omega \in C^{2+\epsilon}$, $\epsilon > 0$).*

*Then, for any given positive initial mass $M > 0$, system (2.1) possesses a unique positive complex balance equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (u_{1,\infty}, \dots, u_{n,\infty})$ satisfying the mass conservation law (2.3). Moreover, each solution to (2.1) with positive initial mass $M$ converges exponentially to this equilibrium with computable rates, i.e.*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \|u_i(t) - u_{i,\infty}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq Ce^{-\lambda t} \qquad \text{for all } t > 0,$$

*where $C, \lambda$ are constants, which can be computed explicitly.*

The following elementary inequality, which was proved in [10] (in a variant), will be useful in the following sections.

**Lemma 2.2** (A finite dimensional inequality, see [10]). *Assume that the network $\mathcal{N}$ is weakly reversible and consists of one strongly connect component.*

*Then, for all $\boldsymbol{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_N)$ satisfying*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i c_i = 0,$$

*with $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N$ are positive constants, there holds*

$$\sum_{i,j=1;i<j}^{N} (a_{ij} + a_{ji})(c_i - c_j)^2 \geq \eta \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i^2$$

*for an* explicit *constant $\eta > 0$ depending only on $\alpha_i$, $a_{ij}$ and $N$.*

*Proof.* First, thanks to the weak reversibility of $\mathcal{N}$, and since $\mathcal{N}$ contains only one strongly connected component, we observe for every $S_i$ and $S_j$ in $\mathcal{N}$ that there exist a chain of nontrivial reactions starting from $S_i$ and finishing at $S_j$ and vice versa. Hence, by using iteratively the triangle inequality along such chains of reactions in cases where $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 0$, we can estimate (see [10, Lemma 2.4] for the details)

$$\sum_{i,j=1;i<j}^{N} (a_{ij} + a_{ji})(c_i - c_j)^2 \geq \zeta \sum_{i,j=1;i<j}^{N} (c_i - c_j)^2 \tag{2.6}$$

for some explicit constant $\zeta > 0$, say $\zeta \leq N^{-N}$.

Now, we have for any $1 \leq i_0 \leq N$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i,j=1;i<j}^{N} (c_i - c_j)^2 &\geq \sum_{j=1;j\neq i_0}^{N} (c_{i_0} - c_j)^2 \geq \sum_{j=1;j\neq i_0}^{N} \frac{1}{\alpha_j^2}(\alpha_j c_{i_0} - \alpha_j c_j)^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{(N-1)\max_{i=1,\dots,N}\{\alpha_i^2\}} \left( c_{i_0} \sum_{j=1;j\neq i_0}^{N} \alpha_j - \sum_{j=1;j\neq i_0}^{N} \alpha_j c_j \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{(N-1)\max_{i=1,\dots,N}\{\alpha_i^2\}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \alpha_j \right)^2 c_{i_0}^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

By combining (2.6) and (2.7) we arrive at

$$\sum_{i,j=1;i<j}^{N} (a_{ij} + a_{ji})(c_i - c_j)^2 \geq \frac{\zeta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N} \alpha_i \right)^2}{(N-1)\max_{i=1,\dots,N}\{\alpha_i^2\}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} c_i^2$$

which is the desired result. □

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section, we denote by $\boldsymbol{c} = (L, P, \ell, p)$ the vector of concentrations of the model system (1.1). Following Section 2, we introduce the relative entropy between two solution trajectories $\boldsymbol{c}_1 = (L_1, P_1, \ell_1, p_1)$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_2 = (L_2, P_2, \ell_2, p_2)$ as follow

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_1|\boldsymbol{c}_2) = \int_\Omega \left(\frac{L_1^2}{L_2} + \frac{P_1^2}{P_2}\right) dx + \int_\Gamma \frac{\ell_1^2}{\ell_2} dS + \int_{\Gamma_2} \frac{p_1^2}{p_2} dS. \tag{3.1}$$

Corresponding to (2.5), we can compute the entropy dissipation functional corresponding to (3.1) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}_1|\boldsymbol{c}_2) &= -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_1|\boldsymbol{c}_2) \\
&= 2d_L \int_\Omega L_2 \left|\nabla \frac{L_1}{L_2}\right|^2 dx + 2d_P \int_\Omega P_2 \left|\nabla \frac{P_1}{P_2}\right|^2 dx + 2d_\ell \int_\Gamma \ell_2 \left|\nabla_\Gamma \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2}\right|^2 dS + 2d_p \int_{\Gamma_2} p_2 \left|\nabla \frac{p_1}{p_2}\right|^2 dS \\
&\quad + \int_\Omega (\alpha P_2 + \beta L_2)\left(\frac{L_1}{L_2} - \frac{P_1}{P_2}\right)^2 dx + \int_\Gamma (\lambda L_2 + \gamma \ell_2)\left(\frac{L_1}{L_2} - \frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2}\right)^2 dS \\
&\quad + \int_{\Gamma_2} \xi p_2 \left(\frac{P_1}{P_2} - \frac{p_1}{p_2}\right)^2 dS + \int_{\Gamma_2} \sigma \ell_2 \left(\frac{\ell_1}{\ell_2} - \frac{p_1}{p_2}\right)^2 dS.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

The following Lemma 3.1 proves the existence of a unique positive equilibrium provided positive initial mass $M > 0$. The main difficulties are the complex balance structure of the equilibrium (with the associated mass conservation law preventing standard coercivity arguments) and the mixed boundary conditions impeding classical solutions and thus, the direct use of classical maximum principles.

**Lemma 3.1** (Existence of a unique positive equilibrium)**.**
*Let $\Omega$ be a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n = 2, 3$ with smooth boundary $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$.*

*Then, for any positive initial mass $M > 0$, the system (1.1) possesses a unique positive equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (L_\infty, P_\infty, \ell_\infty, p_\infty)$ satisfying the mass conservation*

$$\int_\Omega (L_\infty(x) + P_\infty(x))dx + \int_\Gamma \ell_\infty(x) dS + \int_{\Gamma_2} p_\infty(x) dS = M. \tag{3.3}$$

*Moreover, $L_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega}) \cap H^2(\Omega)$, $P_\infty \in L^\infty(\Omega) \cap H^{3/2}(\Omega)$, $\ell_\infty \in C(\Gamma) \cap H^2(\Gamma)$ and $p_\infty \in C(\overline{\Gamma_2}) \cap H^2(\Gamma_2)$, and satisfy*

$$\begin{gathered}
0 < a \le L_\infty(x) \le A \quad \text{for all } x \in \overline{\Omega}, \\
0 < a \le P_\infty(x) \le A \quad \text{for almost all } x \in \Omega, \\
0 < a \le \ell_\infty(x) \le A \quad \text{for all } x \in \Gamma
\end{gathered}$$

*and*

$$0 < a \le p_\infty(x) \le A \quad \text{for all } x \in \overline{\Gamma_2}$$

*for some constants $0 < a \le A < +\infty$.*

*Proof.* We will first prove that the equilibrium system has non-negative solutions and then show that equilibria are indeed bounded and strictly positive. Finally, the uniqueness of equilibrium follows from the vanishing of entropy-dissipation functional (3.2).

In order to prove the existence of nonnegative equilibria via a fixed point argument, we consider the following auxiliary system

$$\begin{cases}
-d_L \Delta L + \beta L = \alpha P_0, & x \in \Omega, \\
-d_P \Delta P + \alpha P = \beta L_0, & x \in \Omega, \\
\quad d_L \partial_\nu L + \lambda L = \gamma \ell_0, & x \in \Gamma, \\
\quad d_P \partial_\nu P = \chi_{\Gamma_2} \xi p_0, & x \in \Gamma, \\
-d_\ell \Delta_\Gamma \ell + (\lambda + \sigma\chi_{\Gamma_2})\ell = \lambda L_0|_\Gamma, & x \in \Gamma, \\
-d_p \Delta_{\Gamma_2} p + \xi p = \sigma \ell_0, & x \in \Gamma_2, \\
\quad d_p \partial_{\nu_{\Gamma_2}} p = 0, & x \in \partial\Gamma_2
\end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

where $(L_0, P_0, \ell_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Y}$ are given in the space

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{(U, V, u, v) \in H^1(\Omega) \times L^2(\Omega) \times L^2(\Gamma) \times L^2(\Gamma_2) : U, V, u, v \ge 0\}.$$

By standard linear elliptic equation theory, there exists a unique weak solution $(L, P, \ell, p) \in H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega) \times H^1(\Gamma) \times H^1(\Gamma_2)$ for (3.4). Thanks to the nonnegativity of $(L_0, P_0, \ell_0, p_0) \in \mathcal{Y}$ and the weak

maximum principle (cf. e.g. [14]), this solution is also nonnegative: Indeed, by testing, for instance, the equation for $P$ by the negative part $P_- = -\min\{P, 0\}$, we calculate with $PP_- = -(P_-)^2$

$$-\int_\Gamma \chi_{\Gamma_2}\xi p_0 P_- \, dS + d_P \int_\Omega \chi_{\{P\le 0\}} |\nabla P|^2 \, dx = +\alpha \int_\Omega (P_-)^2 + \beta \int_\Omega L_0 P_- \, dx, \tag{3.5}$$

and observe that the left hand side is nonpositive while the right hand side is nonnegative provided that $p_0$ and $L_0$ are nonnegative. Thus, both sides have to equal zero and, as a consequence, $\int_\Omega (P_-)^2 = 0$, which implies the nonnegativity of $P$.

Moreover, the smoothness of the boundary $\partial\Omega$ allows to deduce higher regularity for $L$, namely $L \in H^2(\Omega)$ thanks to $P_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$ and $\ell_0 \in L^2(\Gamma)$. In particular, the following *a prior* estimate holds

$$\|L\|_{H^2(\Omega)} + \|P\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|\ell\|_{H^1(\Gamma)} + \|p\|_{H^1(\Gamma_2)} \le C\left(\|L_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)} + \|P_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \|\ell_0\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} + \|p_0\|_{L^2(\Gamma_2)}\right).$$

By defining $\mathfrak{T} : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{Y}$ by $\mathfrak{T}(L_0, P_0, \ell_0, p_0) = (L, P, \ell, p)$, we obtain from the previous *a priori* estimate that $\mathfrak{T}$ is a compact operator. Hence, it follows from the Schauder fixed point theorem that there exist fixed points $(L_\infty, P_\infty, \ell_\infty, p_\infty)$ of $\mathfrak{T}$, and these fixed points are thus nonnegative solutions to the equilibrium system. Note that uniqueness of the fixed points $(L_\infty, P_\infty, \ell_\infty, p_\infty)$ can not be supposed as such, since we expect equilibria to exist for any given mass $M$.

Next, again by maximal regularity for linear elliptic equations, we obtain $L_\infty \in H^2(\Omega)$, $\ell_\infty \in H^2(\Gamma)$ and $p_\infty \in H^2(\Gamma_2)$, which implies $L_\infty \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, $\ell_\infty \in C(\Gamma)$ and $p_\infty \in C(\overline{\Gamma_2})$ thanks to Sobolev embeddings and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The continuity of $L_\infty, \ell_\infty$ and $p_\infty$ and the compactness of $\overline{\Omega}$, $\Gamma$ and $\overline{\Gamma_2}$ imply also the upper bounds

$$L_\infty, \ell_\infty, p_\infty \le A < +\infty$$

for a constant $A$.

For $P_\infty$ satisfying the mixed Neumann boundary condition $d_P \partial_\nu P_\infty = \chi_{\Gamma_2} p_\infty$ with $\chi_{\Gamma_2} \in L^\infty(\Gamma)$ being discontinuous, maximal elliptic regularity only yields $P_\infty \in H^{3/2}(\Omega)$, which is insufficient to conclude boundedness in three space dimensions, see e.g. [8]. However, we are able to construct supersolutions $\hat{P}$ as the solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -d_P \Delta \hat{P} + \alpha \hat{P} = \beta \|L_\infty\|_\infty, & x \in \Omega, \\ d_P \partial_\nu \hat{P} = \xi \|p_\infty\|_\infty, & x \in \partial\Gamma. \end{cases}$$

For the supersolutions $\hat{P}$, standard elliptic theory implies the maximal regularity $\hat{P} \in H^2(\Omega)$ und thus continuity and boundedness. Moreover, the same weak maximum principle argument as in (3.5) yields $\hat{P} \ge P_\infty$ and thus the upper bound

$$P_\infty \le A < +\infty$$

for a constant $A$.

We will show now that if $\ell_\infty \equiv 0$, then $L_\infty = P_\infty = p_\infty = 0$. Indeed, with $\ell_\infty \equiv 0$ it follows immediately that $p_\infty \equiv 0$. By multiplying the equation of $L_\infty$ by $\beta L_\infty$, the equation of $P_\infty$ by $\alpha P_\infty$, and by summing the two equations, we calculate with $p_\infty \equiv 0$

$$d_L \|\nabla L_\infty\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \lambda \|L_\infty\|^2_{L^2(\Gamma)} + d_P \|\nabla P_\infty\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_\Omega (\beta L_\infty - \alpha P_\infty)^2 \, dx = 0,$$

which implies $L_\infty \equiv 0$ and eventually $P_\infty \equiv 0$.

Therefore, whenever a positive mass $M > 0$ is considered, the corresponding equilibrium state has to satisfy $\ell_\infty \not\equiv 0$, and consequently $p_\infty \not\equiv 0$ and $P_\infty \not\equiv 0$.

From the continuity of $\ell_\infty$, we obtain that $p_\infty$ is actually the unique classical solution to

$$\begin{cases} -d_p \Delta_{\Gamma_2} p_\infty + \xi p_\infty = \sigma \ell_\infty, & x \in \Gamma_2, \\ d_p \partial_{\nu_{\Gamma_2}} p_\infty = 0, & x \in \partial\Gamma_2 \end{cases}$$

Since $\ell_\infty$ is nonnegative and not identically zero, we can apply the classical maximum principle to conclude $p_\infty(x) \ge a > 0$ for $x \in \overline{\Gamma_2}$ and a constant $a > 0$.

Next, by considering the auxiliary equation

$$-d_\ell \Delta_\Gamma \ell^* + (\gamma + \sigma)\ell^* = \lambda L_\infty|_\Gamma, \quad x \in \Gamma,$$

and by recalling the continuity and nonnegativity of $L_\infty \not\equiv 0$, the strong maximum applied to the unique classical solution $\ell^*$ implies that $\ell^*(x) \ge a > 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma$ and a constant $a > 0$. Moreover, by a weak maximum principle argument analog to (3.5), we have that $\ell^*$ is a subsolution to $\ell_\infty$, i.e. $\ell_\infty(x) \ge \ell^*(x) \ge a > 0$ for all $x \in \Gamma$.

Moreover, we consider the unique classical solutions $L^*$ of the auxiliary system

$$\begin{cases} -d_L\Delta L^* + \beta L^* = 0, & x \in \Omega, \\ d_L\partial_\nu L^* + \lambda L^* = \gamma \ell_\infty, & x \in \Gamma, \end{cases}$$

for which the classical maximum principle and the lower bound $\ell_\infty(x) \geq a > 0$ implies $L^*(x) \geq a > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ and a constant $a > 0$. Furthermore, by the weak maximum principle, $L^*$ is a subsolutions to $L_\infty$, i.e. $L_\infty(x) \geq L^* \geq a > 0$ for all $x \in \Omega$.

Finally, by considering the unique classical solution $P^*$ of the auxiliary system

$$\begin{cases} -d_P\Delta P^* + \alpha P^* = \beta L_\infty, & x \in \Omega, \\ d_P\partial_\nu P^* = 0, & x \in \partial\Gamma, \end{cases}$$

the weak maximum principle shows $P^*$ to be subsolutions, which is bounded below by a positive constants due to the strong maximum principle applied to $P^*$, i.e. $P_\infty(x) \geq P^*(x) \geq a > 0$ for $x \in \Omega$ and a constant $a > 0$. This finishes the proof of the lower and upper bounds.

To prove the uniqueness of the equilibrium for a given positive mass $M > 0$, we assume that the existence of two different equilibria $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{(1)} = (L_\infty^{(1)}, P_\infty^{(1)}, \ell_\infty^{(1)}, p_\infty^{(1)})$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (L_\infty, P_\infty, \ell_\infty, p_\infty)$ as constructed above. Then, obviously the entropy-dissipation of the relative entropy between $\boldsymbol{c}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ vanishes, i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = 0.$$

Thanks to (3.2), this implies

$$\frac{L_\infty^{(1)}}{L_\infty} \equiv \frac{P_\infty^{(1)}}{P_\infty} \equiv \frac{\ell_\infty^{(1)}}{\ell_\infty} \equiv \frac{p_\infty^{(1)}}{p_\infty} \equiv k$$

for some constant $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$. Hence, the conservation law (3.3) implies $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty^{(1)} \equiv \boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ provided a fixed positive mass $M > 0$. □

**Remark 3.1.** *Note that the existence of a nonnegative equilibrium can be proved independently of the space dimension. The positive lower and upper bounds, however, are based on classical maximum principles arguments. Due to the discontinuity of the characteristic function $\chi_{\Gamma_2}$, we do not get classical equilibrium solutions but only weak solutions with higher regularity (e.g. $L_\infty \in H^2(\Omega)$, $P_\infty \in H^{3/2}(\Omega)$), which restricts our prove to space dimensions $n \leq 3$. The case of higher spaces dimension remains as an open problem.*

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on the following crucial Lemma 3.2, which establishes a so called *entropy entropy-dissipation estimate* and constitutes the key idea of the entropy method, which aims to quantify the entropy dissipation in terms of the relative entropy towards the equilibrium via a functional inequality independent of the flow of a PDE model, see e.g. [5, 6].

In order to prove the entropy entropy-dissipation estimate in Lemma 3.2 and in particular as a consequence of having to prove an entropy method for the space inhomogeneous equilibria $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty = (L_\infty, P_\infty, \ell_\infty, p_\infty)$, it will be highly convenient to introduce the following abbreviations, weighted quantities and inequalities:

- Norms: we will denote by $\|\cdot\|_\Omega$, $\|\cdot\|_\Gamma$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\Gamma_2}$ the norms in $L^2(\Omega)$, $L^2(\Gamma)$ and $L^2(\Gamma_2)$ respectively;
- New variables (weighted deviations around equilibrium values):

$$U = \frac{L - L_\infty}{L_\infty}, \quad V = \frac{P - P_\infty}{P_\infty}, \quad u = \frac{\ell - \ell_\infty}{\ell_\infty}, \quad v = \frac{p - p_\infty}{p_\infty};$$

- New measures:

$$dL_\infty = L_\infty dx, \qquad dP_\infty = P_\infty dx,$$
$$dS_{L_\infty} = L_\infty|_\Gamma \, dS, \qquad dS_{P_\infty} = P_\infty|_\Gamma \, dS,$$
$$d\ell_\infty = \ell_\infty dS, \qquad dp_\infty = p_\infty dS;$$

- Weighted averages:

$$\overline{U} = \frac{1}{\int_\Omega dL_\infty} \int_\Omega U dL_\infty, \quad \overline{V} = \frac{1}{\int_\Omega dP_\infty} \int_\Omega V dP_\infty,$$
$$\overline{u} = \frac{1}{\int_\Gamma d\ell_\infty} \int_\Gamma \ell d\ell_\infty, \quad \overline{v} = \frac{1}{\int_{\Gamma_2} dp_\infty} \int_{\Gamma_2} p dp_\infty.$$

- Weighted Poincare's Inequalities:

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla U|^2 dL_\infty \geq P_L \int_\Omega |U-\overline{U}|^2 dL_\infty, \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla V|^2 dP_\infty \geq P_P \int_\Omega |V-\overline{V}|^2 dP_\infty, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\int_\Gamma |\nabla_\Gamma u|^2 d\ell_\infty \geq P_\ell \int_\Gamma |u-\overline{u}|^2 d\ell_\infty, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\int_{\Gamma_2} |\nabla_{\Gamma_2} v|^2 dp_\infty \geq P_p \int_{\Gamma_2} |v-\overline{v}|^2 dp_\infty; \tag{3.8}$$

- Weighted Trace Inequalities:

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla U|^2 dL_\infty \geq T_L \int_\Gamma |U|_\Gamma - \overline{U}|^2 dS_{L_\infty}, \quad \int_\Omega |\nabla V|^2 dP_\infty \geq T_P \int_\Gamma |V|_\Gamma - \overline{V}|^2 dS_{P_\infty}. \tag{3.9}$$

With respect to the new notations, note that the relative entropy (3.1), in particular the relative entropy w.r.t. the equilibrium $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$, i.e. $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) + M, \qquad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = M, \tag{3.10}$$

and that

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = \int_\Omega U^2 dL_\infty + \int_\Omega V^2 dP_\infty + \int_\Gamma u^2 d\ell_\infty + \int_{\Gamma_2} v^2 dp_\infty. \tag{3.11}$$

Moreover, the entropy dissipation law (3.2) rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &= -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \\
&= 2d_L \int_\Omega |\nabla U|^2 dL_\infty + 2d_P \int_\Omega |\nabla V|^2 dP_\infty + 2d_\ell \int_\Gamma |\nabla_\Gamma u|^2 d\ell_\infty + 2d_p \int_{\Gamma_2} |\nabla_{\Gamma_2} v|^2 dp_\infty \\
&\quad + \alpha \int_\Omega |U-V|^2 dP_\infty + \beta \int_\Omega |U-V|^2 dL_\infty + \lambda \int_\Gamma |U|_\Gamma - u|^2 dS_{L_\infty} \\
&\quad + \gamma \int_\Gamma |U|_\Gamma - u|^2 d\ell_\infty + \xi \int_{\Gamma_2} |V|_\Gamma - v|^2 dp_\infty + \sigma \int_{\Gamma_2} |u-v|^2 d\ell_\infty,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

and from (3.10) it follows readily that $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = \mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$.

*Proof of Theorem 1.1.*
The proof of Theorem 1.1 is a direct consequence of the key functional inequality (3.13) in the following Lemma 3.2 and a classical Gronwall argument applied to the entropy dissipation law (3.12), which is weakly satisfied (in the sense of being integrated in time) by the weak global solutions to system (1.1) constructed in [11]. □

**Lemma 3.2** (Entropy entropy-dissipation estimate for system (1.1))**.**
*Fix a positive initial mass $M > 0$. Then, for any non-negative measurable functions $\boldsymbol{c} = (L, P, \ell, p)$ satisfying the mass conservation*

$$\int_\Omega (L(x) + P(x))dx + \int_\Gamma \ell(x) dS + \int_{\Gamma_2} p(x) dS = M,$$

*the entropy entropy-dissipation estimate*

$$\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \geq \lambda_0 \, \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \tag{3.13}$$

*holds, where $\boldsymbol{c}_\infty$ is the equilibrium given in Lemma 3.1, and $\lambda_0 > 0$ is a constant which can be estimated explicitly.*

*Proof.* Note that $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = 0$ for all constant states satisfying $U = V = u = v$ while $\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = 0$ if and only if $U = V = u = v = 0$. Hence, the constraint provided by mass conservation law, i.e.

$$\int_\Omega U(x) dL_\infty + \int_\Omega V(x) dP_\infty + \int_\Gamma u(x) d\ell_\infty + \int_{\Gamma_2} v(x) dp_\infty = 0,$$

plays a crucial role in the inequality (3.13), which can not hold otherwise.

The proof of this lemma is therefore divided into two steps, where the mass conservation law enters the proof in the first step. At first, we remark that the relative entropy enjoys to following additivity property

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = \mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) + \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} = (\overline{U}, \overline{V}, \overline{u}, \overline{v})$, and that the second term on the right hand side is controlled in terms of the entropy dissipation in Step 1, while the first term is controlled in Step 2:

**Step 1.** First, we prove that there exists an explicit constant $K_0 > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} - \boldsymbol{c}_\infty | \boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \geq K_0 \, \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} - \boldsymbol{c}_\infty | \boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \tag{3.14}$$

Indeed, (3.14) writes explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha|\overline{U} - \overline{V}|^2 \int_\Omega dP_\infty + \beta|\overline{U} - \overline{V}|^2 \int_\Omega dL_\infty + \lambda|\overline{U} - \overline{u}|^2 \int_\Gamma dS_{L_\infty} \\
+ \gamma|\overline{U} - \overline{u}|^2 \int_\Gamma d\ell_\infty + \xi|\overline{V} - \overline{v}|^2 \int_{\Gamma_2} dp_\infty + \sigma|\overline{u} - \overline{v}|^2 \int_{\Gamma_2} d\ell_\infty \\
\geq K_0 \left( \overline{U}^2 \int_\Omega dL_\infty + \overline{V}^2 \int_\Omega dP_\infty + \overline{u}^2 \int_\Gamma d\ell_\infty + \overline{v}^2 \int_{\Gamma_2} dp_\infty \right)
\end{aligned}$$

under the mass constrain

$$\overline{U} \int_\Omega dL_\infty + \overline{V} \int_\Omega dP_\infty + \overline{u} \int_\Gamma d\ell_\infty + \overline{v} \int_{\Gamma_2} dp_\infty = 0.$$

However, this is nothing but a consequence of Lemma 2.2 applied to the vector of averaged concentrations $(\overline{U}, \overline{V}, \overline{u}, \overline{v})$ after noting that the network of reactions between $L, P, \ell$ and $p$ (see Figure 1.1) is weakly reversible with one strongly connected component. Thus, the constants $K_0$ can be taken as the corresponding constant $\eta > 0$ of Lemma 2.2.

**Step 2.** We introduce the following deviations from the averaged values by $\delta_U = U - \overline{U}, \delta_V = V - \overline{V}, \delta_u = u - \overline{u}$ and $\delta_v = v - \overline{v}$. Note that

$$\int_\Omega \delta_U dL_\infty = \int_\Omega \delta_V dP_\infty = \int_\Gamma \delta_u d\ell_\infty = \int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_v p_\infty = 0.$$

Moreover, we can rewrite

$$\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{c}_\infty | \boldsymbol{c}_\infty) = \int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dL_\infty + \int_\Omega \delta_v^2 dP_\infty + \int_\Gamma \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty + \int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_v^2 dp_\infty + \mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}} - \boldsymbol{c}_\infty | \boldsymbol{c}_\infty). \tag{3.15}$$

By using the weighted Poincare and Trace inequalities in (3.6)–(3.9), we can estimate $\mathcal{D}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c} - \boldsymbol{c}_\infty | \boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \geq d_L P_L \int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dL_\infty + d_P P_P \int_\Omega \delta_V^2 dP_\infty + d_L T_L \int_\Gamma \delta_U^2 dS_{L_\infty} + d_P T_P \int_\Gamma \delta_V^2 dS_{P_\infty} \\
+ 2d_\ell P_\ell \int_\Gamma \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty + 2d_p P_p \int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_v^2 dp_\infty \\
+ \left[ \alpha \int_\Omega |U - V|^2 dP_\infty + \beta \int_\Omega |U - V|^2 dL_\infty + \lambda \int_\Gamma |U|_\Gamma - u|^2 dS_{L_\infty} \right. \\
\left. + \gamma \int_\Gamma |U|_\Gamma - u|^2 d\ell_\infty + \xi \int_{\Gamma_2} |V|_{\Gamma_2} - v|^2 dp_\infty + \sigma \int_{\Gamma_2} |u - v|^2 d\ell_\infty \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

We denote by $J_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, 6$ the last six terms on the right hand side of (3.16). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= \alpha \int_\Omega |U - V|^2 dP_\infty \\
&= \alpha \int_\Omega |\overline{U} - \overline{V} + \delta_U - \delta_V|^2 dP_\infty \\
&\geq \epsilon_1 \alpha \int_\Omega |\overline{U} - \overline{V}|^2 dP_\infty - \frac{2\alpha\epsilon_1}{1 - \epsilon_1} \left( \int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dP_\infty + \int_\Omega \delta_V^2 dP_\infty \right) \\
&\geq \epsilon_1 \alpha \int_\Omega |\overline{U} - \overline{V}|^2 dP_\infty - \frac{2\alpha\epsilon_1}{1 - \epsilon_1} \left( \left\| \frac{P_\infty}{L_\infty} \right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dL_\infty + \int_\Omega \delta_V^2 dP_\infty \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

for all $\epsilon_1 \in (0,1)$. Very similarly, we get

$$J_2 \geq \epsilon_2\beta \int_\Omega |\overline{U}-\overline{V}|^2 dL_\infty - \frac{2\beta\epsilon_2}{1-\epsilon_2}\left(\int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dL_\infty + \left\|\frac{L_\infty}{P_\infty}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \int_\Omega \delta_V^2 dP_\infty\right), \tag{3.18}$$

$$J_3 \geq \epsilon_3\lambda \int_\Gamma |\overline{U}-\overline{u}|^2 dS_{L_\infty} - \frac{2\lambda\epsilon_3}{1-\epsilon_3}\left(\int_\Gamma (\delta_U|_\Gamma)^2\, dS_{L_\infty} + \left\|\frac{L_\infty}{\ell_\infty}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} \int_\Gamma \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty\right), \tag{3.19}$$

$$J_4 \geq \epsilon_4\gamma \int_\Gamma |\overline{U}-\overline{u}|^2 d\ell_\infty - \frac{2\gamma\epsilon_4}{1-\epsilon_4}\left(\left\|\frac{\ell_\infty}{L_\infty}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma)} \int_\Gamma (\delta_U|_\Gamma)^2\, dS_{L_\infty} + \int_\Gamma \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty\right), \tag{3.20}$$

$$\tag{3.21}$$

and

$$J_6 \geq \epsilon_6\sigma \int_{\Gamma_2} |\overline{u}-\overline{v}|^2 d\ell_\infty - \frac{2\sigma\epsilon_6}{1-\epsilon_6}\left(\int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty + \left\|\frac{\ell_\infty}{p_\infty}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_2)} \int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_v^2 dp_\infty\right) \tag{3.22}$$

with $\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3, \epsilon_4, \epsilon_6 \in (0,1)$. For $J_5$, the lack of continuity of $P_\infty$ at the boundary $\Gamma_2$ prevents a similar estimate as above, since it is unclear how to control the term $\|\frac{p_\infty}{P_\infty}\|_{L^\infty(\Gamma_2)}$. However, the weak reversibility of system (1.1) allows first to estimate $J_5 \geq 0$ and then use the triangle inequality to have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\left(\epsilon_2\beta \int_\Omega |\overline{U}-\overline{V}|^2 dL_\infty + \epsilon_3\lambda \int_\Gamma |\overline{U}-\overline{u}|^2 dS_{L_\infty} + \epsilon_6\sigma \int_{\Gamma_2} |\overline{u}-\overline{v}|^2 d\ell_\infty\right)\\ \geq \frac{1}{6}\min\left\{\epsilon_2\beta \int_\Omega dL_\infty; \epsilon_3\lambda \int_\Gamma dS_{L_\infty}; \epsilon_6\sigma \int_{\Gamma_2} d\ell_\infty\right\} |\overline{V}-\overline{v}|^2 =: \omega|\overline{V}-\overline{v}|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

By combining (3.16)–(3.22) and by choosing $\epsilon_1, \ldots, \epsilon_6$ small enough (for instance in order to ensure that for some $\eta_1 > 0$

$$d_L P_L - \frac{2\alpha\epsilon_1}{1-\epsilon_1}\left\|\frac{P_\infty}{L_\infty}\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} - \frac{2\beta\epsilon_2}{1-\epsilon_2} \geq \eta_1 > 0$$

with $\|\frac{P_\infty}{L_\infty}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{A}{a}$ by Lemma 3.1), we can estimate $\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)$ below as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) \geq \frac{1}{2}\min\{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4,2\omega,\epsilon_6\}\mathcal{D}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)\\ + \eta_1\int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dL_\infty + \eta_2\int_\Omega \delta_V^2 dP_\infty + \eta_3\int_\Gamma \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty + \eta_4\int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_v^2 dp_\infty\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

where $\omega$ is defined in (3.23). Hence, by using (3.14) and (3.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty) &\geq \frac{1}{2}K_0\min\{\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\epsilon_3,\epsilon_4,2\omega,\epsilon_6\}\mathcal{E}(\overline{\boldsymbol{c}}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)\\ &\quad + \min\{\eta_1,\eta_2,\eta_3,\eta_4\}\left(\int_\Omega \delta_U^2 dL_\infty + \int_\Omega \delta_V^2 dP_\infty + \int_\Gamma \delta_u^2 d\ell_\infty + \int_{\Gamma_2} \delta_v^2 dp_\infty\right)\\ &\geq \lambda_0\mathcal{E}(\boldsymbol{c}-\boldsymbol{c}_\infty|\boldsymbol{c}_\infty)\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

with $\lambda_0 = \frac{1}{2}\min\{2K_0\epsilon_1, 2K_0\epsilon_2, 2K_0\epsilon_3, 2K_0\epsilon_4, 4K_0\omega, 2K_0\epsilon_6, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \eta_4\}$. □

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In this section, we denote by $\mathbf{u} = (u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_7)$ and $\mathbf{w} = (w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_7)$. Moreover, we define (in the spirit of the relative entropy (2.4) of first-order reaction networks) the relative entropy functional associated to (1.3):

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{w}) = \int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} \left(\frac{|u_0|^2}{w_0} + \frac{|u_1|^2}{w_1}\right) dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}| \sum_{i=2}^7 \frac{|u_i|^2}{w_i}, \tag{4.1}$$

which dissipates (analog to the entropy dissipation (2.5)) due to the following entropy dissipation functional:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{w}) &= -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{w})\\ &= D\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} w_0\left|\nabla\frac{u_0}{w_0}\right|^2 dx + D\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} w_1\left|\nabla\frac{u_1}{w_1}\right|^2 dx\\ &\quad + r_{\rm act}\,p_{JAK}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} w_0\left[\frac{u_0}{w_0}\Big|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} - \frac{u_1}{w_1}\Big|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\right]^2 dS + r_{\rm imp2}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} w_1\left[\frac{u_1}{w_1}\Big|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} - \frac{u_3}{w_3}\right]^2 dS\\ &\quad + r_{\rm imp}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} w_0\left[\frac{u_0}{w_0}\Big|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} - \frac{u_2}{w_2}\right]^2 dS + r_{\rm exp}w_2\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}}\left[\frac{u_0}{w_0}\Big|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} - \frac{u_2}{w_2}\right]^2 dS\\ &\quad + r_{\rm delay}\,w_7\left[\frac{u_7}{w_7} - \frac{u_2}{w_2}\right]^2 + \sum_{i=3}^{6} r_{\rm delay}\,w_i\left[\frac{u_i}{w_i} - \frac{u_{i+1}}{w_{i+1}}\right]^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

**Lemma 4.1** (Existence of a unique positive equilibrium of (1.3))**.**
*For any positive initial mass $M > 0$, system (1.3) possesses a unique equilibrium $\mathbf{u}_\infty = (u_{0,\infty}, \dots, u_{7,\infty})$ satisfying the mass conservation (1.5), i.e.*

$$\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (u_{0,\infty}(x) + u_{1,\infty}(x))dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}|\sum_{i=2}^{7} u_{i,\infty} = M > 0.$$

*Moreover, $u_{2,\infty}, \dots, u_{7,\infty}$ are positive and $u_{0,\infty}, u_{1,\infty} \in C(\overline{\Omega}_{\rm cyt}) \cap C^2(\Omega_{\rm cyt})$ satisfy*

$$0 < b \le u_{0,\infty}(x), u_{1,\infty}(x) \le B < +\infty, \qquad \text{for all } x \in \Omega_{\rm cyt}$$

*for some constants $0 < b \le B \le +\infty$.*

*Proof.* From (1.3c), we easily see that

$$u_{3,\infty} = u_{4,\infty} = u_{5,\infty} = u_{6,\infty} = u_{7,\infty} = \frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{r_{\rm delay}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{1,\infty}(y)dS \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}u_{2,\infty} &= \frac{r_{\rm delay}}{r_{\rm exp}}u_{7,\infty} + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{r_{\rm exp}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{0,\infty}(y)dS\\ &= \frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{r_{\rm exp}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{1,\infty}(y)dS + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{r_{\rm exp}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{0,\infty}(y)dS.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

It thus remains to solve the following non-local linear elliptic system of $u_{0,\infty}$ and $u_{1,\infty}$,

$$\begin{cases} D\Delta u_{0,\infty}(x) = 0, & x \in \Omega_{\rm cyt},\\ D\partial_{n_1}u_{0,\infty}(y) = -\frac{r_{\rm act}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}|}p_{JAK}u_{0,\infty}(y), & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm cyt},\\ D\partial_{n_2}u_{0,\infty}(y) = -\frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}u_{0,\infty}(y)\\ \qquad\qquad + \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\left(\frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{1,\infty}\,dS + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{0,\infty}\,dS\right), & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}, \end{cases} \tag{4.5a}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} D\Delta u_{1,\infty}(x) = 0, & x \in \Omega_{\rm cyt},\\ D\partial_{n_1}u_{1,\infty}(y) = \frac{r_{\rm act}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}|}p_{JAK}u_{0,\infty}(y), & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm cyt},\\ D\partial_{n_2}u_{1,\infty}(y) = -\frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}u_{1,\infty}(y), & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}. \end{cases} \tag{4.5b}$$

subject to the mass constraint, which is implied from the mass conservation and (4.3) and (4.4),

$$\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (u_{0,\infty} + u_{1,\infty})dx + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{r_{\rm exp}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{0,\infty}dS + \left(5\frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{r_{\rm delay}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{r_{\rm exp}|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\right)\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{1,\infty}dS = M. \tag{4.6}$$

By considering an auxiliary system as follows

$$\begin{cases} D\Delta u_0 = 0, & x \in \Omega_{\rm cyt}, \\ D\partial_{n_1} u_0 + \frac{r_{\rm act}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}|} p_{JAK} u_0 = 0, & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}, \\ D\partial_{n_2} u_0 + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_0 = \frac{1}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\left(\frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} \widehat{u_1}\, dS + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} \widehat{u_0}\, dS\right), & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}, \\ D\Delta u_1 = 0, & x \in \Omega_{\rm cyt}, \\ D\partial_{n_1} u_1 = \frac{r_{\rm act}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}|} p_{JAK} \widehat{u_0}(y), & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}, \\ D\partial_{n_2} u_1 + \frac{r_{\rm imp}2}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_1 = 0, & y \in \partial\Omega_{\rm nuc} \end{cases} \tag{4.7}$$

we can use similar arguments in Lemma 3.1, namely define for non-negative $(\widehat{u_0}, \widehat{u_1})$ an operator $\mathfrak{L} : (\widehat{u_0}, \widehat{u_1}) \mapsto (u_0, u_1)$ as the solution to (4.7). Then, the existence of a nonnegative weak solution $(u_{0,\infty}, u_{1,\infty}) \in H^1(\Omega_{\rm cyt}) \times H^1(\Omega_{\rm cyt})$ to (4.5a)-(4.5b) follows from the Schauder fixed point theorem applied to $\mathfrak{L}$. In return, this implies nonnegative equilibria $(u_{0,\infty}, \dots, u_{7,\infty})$ to system (1.3).

By applying standard bootstrap arguments to (4.5a) and (4.5b), we obtain that $(u_{0,\infty}, u_{1,\infty})$ is in fact a classical solution, namely $u_{0,\infty}, u_{1,\infty} \in C(\overline{\Omega}_{\rm cyt}) \cap C^2(\Omega_{\rm cyt})$. Hence, $u_{0,\infty}$ and $u_{1,\infty}$ are uniformly bounded above by a positive constant thanks to the compactness of $\overline{\Omega}_{\rm cyt}$. We now prove the strict positivity of $u_{0,\infty}$ and $u_{1,\infty}$. First we show that $u_{0,\infty}$ is not identical to zero on $\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}$. Indeed, assume the reserve is true, we then obtain from (4.5b) that $u_{1,\infty} \equiv 0$. Supposing that $u_{1,\infty} \equiv 0$, it follows from (4.5a) and the strong maximum principle that $u_{0,\infty} \equiv 0$. This violates the mass conservation (4.6). Therefore, $u_{0,\infty} \geq 0$ is not identical to zero on $\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}$ and we get from (4.5b) and the maximum principle that $u_{1,\infty}(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \overline{\Omega}_{\rm cyt}$ which leads to a strictly positive lower bound of $u_{1,\infty}$. The strict positivity of $u_{0,\infty}$ also follows from $u_{0,\infty} \in C(\overline{\Omega}_{\rm cyt})$ and strong maximum principle since the second boundary condition in (4.5b) implies

$$D\partial_n u_{0,\infty}(y) + \frac{r_{\rm imp}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|} u_{0,\infty}(y) \geq \frac{r_{\rm imp2}}{|\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}|^2} \int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} u_{1,\infty} dS$$

and $u_{1,\infty}$ is strictly positive.

The uniqueness of equilibrium can be proved in the same way as Lemma 3.1 thanks to the entropy structures (4.1)and (4.2) so we omit it here. □

Similar to the previous section, we shall improve the presentation of the results by introducing the following notations

- New variables:

$$v_i = \frac{u_i - u_{i,\infty}}{u_{i,\infty}} \qquad \text{for } i = 0, 1, \dots, 7.$$

- New measures:

$$du_{0,\infty} = u_{0,\infty} dx, \qquad du_{1,\infty} = u_{1,\infty} dx,$$

$$d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} = u_{0,\infty}|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\, dS, \qquad d\sigma_{u_{1,\infty}} = u_{1,\infty}|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\, dS.$$

$$dS_{u_{0,\infty}} = u_{0,\infty}|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}}\, dS, \qquad dS_{u_{1,\infty}} = u_{1,\infty}|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}}\, dS.$$

- New parameters:

$$\alpha = r_{\rm act}, \quad \beta = p_{JAK}, \quad \gamma = r_{\rm imp}, \quad \sigma = r_{\rm imp2}, \quad \kappa = r_{\rm exp}, \quad \xi = r_{\rm delay}.$$

- Weighted averages:

$$\overline{v}_0 = \frac{1}{\int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm nuc}} du_{0,\infty}} \int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm nuc}} v_0(t,x) du_{0,\infty}, \qquad \overline{v}_1 = \frac{1}{\int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm nuc}} du_{1,\infty}} \int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm nuc}} v_1(t,x) du_{1,\infty}.$$

Then, analog to (3.10)–(3.12), we can rewrite the relative entropy

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u} - \mathbf{u}_\infty | \mathbf{u}_\infty) = \int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0|^2 du_{0,\infty} + \int\limits_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_1|^2 du_{1,\infty} + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}| \sum_{i=2}^{7} u_{i,\infty} |v_i|^2, \tag{4.8}$$

the its entropy dissipation functional as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) &= -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty)\\ &= D\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |\nabla v_0|^2\, du_{0,\infty} + D\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |\nabla v_1|^2\, du_{1,\infty}\\ &\quad + \alpha\beta\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} \left[v_0|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} - v_1|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\right]^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} + \sigma\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} \left[v_1|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} - v_3\right]^2 dS_{u_{1,\infty}}\\ &\quad + \gamma\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} \left[v_0|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} - v_2\right]^2 dS_{u_{0,\infty}} + \kappa u_{2,\infty}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} \left[v_0|_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} - v_2\right]^2 dS\\ &\quad + \xi u_{7,\infty}\left[v_7 - v_2\right]^2 + \sum_{i=3}^{6} \xi u_{i,\infty}\left[v_i - v_{i+1}\right]^2.\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Finally, the mass conservation law rewrite as

$$\overline{v}_0\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} du_{0,\infty} + \overline{v}_1\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} du_{1,\infty} + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}|\sum_{i=2}^{7} u_{i,\infty}v_i = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.2.*
The proof of Theorem 1.2 is a direct consequence of the key functional inequality (4.12) in the following Lemma 4.2 and a classical Gronwall argument applied to the entropy dissipation law (4.9), which is weakly satisfied by the global solutions constructed in [13]. □

**Lemma 4.2** (Entropy entropy-dissipation estimate for system (1.3))**.**
*Fix a positive initial mass $M > 0$. Then, for any measurable state $\mathbf{u} = (u_0, \dots, u_7)$ satisfying the mass conservation*

$$\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (u_0(x) + u_1(x))dx + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}|\sum_{i=2}^{7} u_i = M \tag{4.11}$$

*the entropy entropy-dissipation inequality*

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \geq \lambda_1\,\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \tag{4.12}$$

*holds, where $\mathbf{u}_\infty$ is the equilibrium given in Lemma 4.1, and $\lambda_1 > 0$ is a constant which can be estimated explicitly.*

*Proof.* The proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 3.2. First, it is straightforward to verify that the relative entropy satisfies to following additivity property:

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) = \mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\overline{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u}_\infty) + \mathcal{E}(\overline{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\overline{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u}_\infty) = \int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-\overline{v}_0|^2 du_{0,\infty} + \int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_1-\overline{v}_1|^2 du_{1,\infty}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(\overline{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) = \overline{v}_0^2\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} du_{0,\infty} + \overline{v}_1^2\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} du_{1,\infty} + |\Omega_{\rm nuc}|\sum_{i=2}^{7} u_{i,\infty}|v_i|^2.$$

**Step 1.** Thanks to the mass conservation law (4.10), it follows from Lemma 2.2 and the weak reversibility of the reaction network in Figure 1.2 that

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \geq L_0\,\mathcal{E}(\overline{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \tag{4.14}$$

for an explicit constant $L_0 > 0$.

**Step 2.** The term $\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\overline{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ can be controlled in terms of the entropy dissipation by using the weighted Poincaré inequalities as follow

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) &\geq D\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |\nabla v_0|^2 du_{0,\infty} + D\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |\nabla v_1|^2 du_{1,\infty}\\ &\geq L_1\left(\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-\overline{v}_0|^2 du_{0,\infty} + \int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_1-\overline{v}_1|^2 du_{1,\infty}\right) = L_1\,\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{u}-\overline{\mathbf{u}}|\mathbf{u}_\infty),\end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

where $L_1 = D\min\{P_{u_{0,\infty}}, P_{u_{1,\infty}}\}$ depends on $D$ and the corresponding weighted Poincaré constants.

Next, we prove for some constant $L_2 > 0$ that

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \geq L_2\,\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty), \tag{4.16}$$

which yields the desired estimate (4.12) with $\lambda_1 = \min\{L_1, L_0L_2\}$ by combining (4.13), (4.14), (4.15) and (4.16). To prove (4.16), we will use the $\mu$-weighted trace inequalities

$$\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu \geq T_{\sigma_\mu}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |f-\overline{f}|^2\,d\sigma_\mu \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_{\rm nuc}} |\nabla f|^2 d\mu \geq T_{S_\mu}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} |f-\overline{f}|^2\,dS_\mu,$$

where $\overline{f} = \frac{1}{\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} d\mu}\int_{\Omega_{\rm cyt}} f d\mu$ to estimate, using the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{u}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty) \geq\ & DT_\mu\left(\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-\overline{v}_0|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} + \int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_1-\overline{v}_1|^2 d\sigma_{u_{1,\infty}} + \alpha\beta\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-v_1|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}}\right)\\
&+\left(DT_\mu\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} |v_0-\overline{v}_0|^2 dS_{u_{0,\infty}} + \gamma\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} |v_0-v_2|^2 dS_{u_{0,\infty}}\right)\\
&+\left(DT_\mu\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} |v_1-\overline{v}_1|^2 dS_{u_{1,\infty}} + \sigma\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} |v_1-v_3|^2 dS_{u_{1,\infty}}\right)\\
&+\xi u_{7,\infty}\left[v_7-v_2\right]^2 + \sum_{i=3}^{6}\xi u_{i,\infty}\left[v_i-v_{i+1}\right]^2\\
\geq\ & C_1|\overline{v}_0-\overline{v}_1|^2\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} + C_2|\overline{v}_0-v_2|^2\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} dS_{u_{0,\infty}} + C_3|\overline{v}_1-v_3|^2\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} dS_{u_{1,\infty}}\\
&+\xi u_{7,\infty}|v_7-v_2|^2 + \sum_{i=3}^{6}\xi u_{i,\infty}|v_i-v_{i+1}|^2\\
\geq\ & 2L_2\mathcal{D}(\overline{\mathbf{u}}-\mathbf{u}_\infty|\mathbf{u}_\infty)
\end{aligned}$$

where $T_\mu = \min\{T_{\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}}}, T_{\sigma_{u_{1,\infty}}}, T_{S_{u_{0,\infty}}}, T_{S_{u_{1,\infty}}}\}$ and

$$C_1 = \frac{1}{3}DT_\mu\min\left\{1;\ \alpha\beta;\ \min_{y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\frac{u_{1,\infty}(y)}{u_{0,\infty}(y)}\right\},\quad C_2 = \frac{1}{2}\min\{DT_\mu;\ \gamma\},\quad C_3 = \frac{1}{2}\min\{DT_\mu;\ \sigma\}$$

and

$$L_2 = \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{\frac{C_1}{\alpha\beta}; \frac{C_2}{2\gamma}; \frac{C_2\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} dS_{u_{0,\infty}}}{2\kappa u_{2,\infty}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm nuc}} dS}; \frac{C_3}{\sigma}; 1\right\}$$

which can be computed explicitly, for instance

$$\begin{aligned}
&DT_\mu\left(\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-\overline{v}_0|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} + \int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_1-\overline{v}_1|^2 d\sigma_{u_{1,\infty}} + \alpha\beta\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-v_1|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}}\right)\\
&\geq DT_\mu\left(\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-\overline{v}_0|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} + \min_{y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\frac{u_{1,\infty}(y)}{u_{0,\infty}(y)}\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_1-\overline{v}_1|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}} + \alpha\beta\int\limits_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} |v_0-v_1|^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}}\right)\\
&\geq \frac{1}{3}DT_\mu\min\left\{1;\ \alpha\beta;\ \min_{y\in\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}}\frac{u_{1,\infty}(y)}{u_{0,\infty}(y)}\right\}\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} (v_0-\overline{v}_0+\overline{v}_1-v_1-v_0+v_1)^2 d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}}\\
&= C_1|\overline{v}_0-\overline{v}_1|^2\int_{\partial\Omega_{\rm cyt}} d\sigma_{u_{0,\infty}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

**Acknowledgements.** The second author was supported by International Research Training Group IGDK 1754. This work has partially been supported by NAWI Graz.

## References


[1] H. Berestycki, J.M. Roquejoffre, L. Rossi, *The influence of a line with fast diffusion on Fisher-KPP propagation*, Journal of mathematical biology 66.4-5 (2013): 743-766.

[2] H. Berestycki, J.M. Roquejoffre, L. Rossi, (2013). *Fisher–KPP propagation in the presence of a line: further effects*, Nonlinearity, 26(9), 2623.

[3] H. Berestycki, A.C. Coulon, J.M. Roquejoffre, L. Rossi, (2015) *The effect of a line with nonlocal diffusion on Fisher-KPP propagation.* Mathematical Models and Methods in Applied Sciences, 25(13), 2519-2562.

[4] J. Betschinger, K. Mechtler, and J.A. Knoblich, *The Par complex directs asymmetric cell division by phosphorylating the cytoskeletal protein Lgl,* Nature (2003) **422**, 326–329.

[5] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, *Exponential decay toward equilibrium via entropy methods for reaction–diffusion equations* Journal of mathematical analysis and applications 319.1 (2006), pp. 157–176.

[6] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, *Entropy methods for reaction-diffusion systems: degenerate diffusion* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. (Supplements Special). Dynamical Systems and Differential Equations. Proceedings of the 6th AIMS International Conference. (2007) pp. 304–312.

[7] L. Desvillettes, K. Fellner, B. Q. Tang, *Trend to equilibrium for reaction-diffusion systems arising from complex balanced chemical reaction networks*, arXiv:1604.04536.

[8] Lawrence C. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, American Mathematical Society, (2010).

[9] K. Fellner, E. Latos, B. Q. Tang, *Well-posedness and exponential equilibration of a volume-surface reaction-diffusion system with nonlinear boundary coupling*, arXiv:1404.2809.

[10] K. Fellner, W. Prager, B.Q. Tang, *The entropy method for reaction-diffusion systems without detailed balance: first order chemical reaction works*, Preprint.

[11] K. Fellner, S. Rosenberger, B.Q. Tang, *Quasi-steady-state approximation and numerical simulation for a volume-surface reaction-diffusion system*, Commun. Math. Sci. **14**, no. 6 (2016), pp. 1553–1580.

[12] K. Fellner, B.Q. Tang, *Explicit exponential convergence to equilibrium for nonlinear reaction-diffusion systems with detailed balance condition*, arXiv:1601.05992.

[13] E. Friedmann, R. Neumann, R. Rannacher, *Well-posedness of a linear spatio-temporal model of the JAK2/STAT5 signaling pathway.* Comm. Math. Anal. **15** (2013), pp. 76–102.

[14] D. Gilbarg, N.S. Trudinger Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, Springer, Berlin (1977).

[15] A. Glitzky, K. Gröger, R. Hünlich, *Free energy and dissipation rate for reaction-diffusion processes of electrically charged species,* Appl. Anal. **60** (1996), pp. 201–217.

[16] A. Glitzky, A. Mielke, *A gradient structure for systems coupling reaction-diffusion effects in bulk and interfaces*, Zeitschrift für angewandte Mathematik und Physik 64.1 (2013), pp. 29–52.

[17] F. Henneke, Bao Q. Tang, *Fast reaction limit of a volume-surface reaction-diffusion system towards a heat equation with dynamical boundary conditions*, Asymptotic Analysis, **98**, no. 4, (2016), pp. 325–339.

[18] F.J.M. Horn and R. Jackson, *General mass action kinetics*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **47** (1972), pp. 81–116.

[19] B. Mayer, G. Emery, D. Berdnik, F. Wirtz-Peitz, and J. Knoblich, *Quantitative analysis of protein dynamics during asymmetric cell division,* Curr. Biology (2005) **15**, 1847–54.

[20] Y.-I. Kwon, J. J. Derby, *Modeling the coupled effects of interfacial and bulk phenomena during solution crystal growth*, J. Cryst. Growth **230** (2001), pp. 328–335.

[21] A. Mielke, *Thermomechanical modeling of energy-reaction-diffusion systems, including bulk-interface interactions*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - Series S, 6.2 (2013), pp. 479–499.

[22] A. Mielke, J. Haskovec, P. A. Markowich, *On uniform decay of the entropy for reaction-diffusion systems*, J. Dyn. Diff. Eqs. **27** (2015), pp. 897–928.

[23] C.V. Pao, Nonlinear Parabolic and Elliptic Equations, Plenum Press, New York (1992).

[24] M. Taylor, Partial Differential Equations I: Basic Theory

[25] F. Wirtz-Peitz, T. Nashimura, and J. Knoblich, *Linking cell cycle to asymmetric division: Aurora-A phosphorylates the Par complex to regulate numb localization,* Cell (2008) **135**, 161–173.



Klemens Fellner

Institute of Mathematics and Scientific Computing, University of Graz, Heinrichstrasse 36, 8010 Graz, Austria

*E-mail address*: klemens.fellner@uni-graz.at

Bao Quoc Tang

Institute of Mathematics and Scientific Computing, University of Graz, Heinrichstrasse 36, 8010 Graz, Austria

*E-mail address*: quoc.tang@uni-graz.at